## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the office action mailed 01/06/2010, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 are pending.

In the office action, the Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 10 for informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 as suggested by the Examiner and, therefore, requests the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 1 and 10.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In reply, Applicant has amended the respective claims to comply with the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are no longer indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,492; "Keller") in view of Bailey et al. (U.S. Patent 6,205,508; "Bailey"). In reply, Applicant submits that Keller and Bailey fail to disclose the claimed embodiments of the invention, as amended.

Applicant submits that Keller discloses an I/O bridge that is coupled to one or more processing nodes and is configured to generate and transmits a non-coherent memory access transaction (Keller at col. 2, lines 8-11) to at least one processing node where it is transformed into a coherent memory access transaction for transmission to another processing node (Keller at col. 2, lines 14-19). Thus, the link between the nodes of Keller are often referred to as a coherent link whereas the link between a node and an I/O bridge are often referred to as a non-coherent link (Keller at col. 4, lines 39-42). In this regard, Keller teaches a coherent memory access transaction for transmission from one processing node to another processing node, which is just the reverse of what is being claimed by the Applicant. Thus, Applicant submits that Keller teaches away from the claimed embodiments of the invention.

In regards to Bailey, Applicant submits that Bailey discloses the transfer of interrupt messages as discrete binary packets (see Abstract of Bailey). However, Applicant submits that the interrupt messaging as disclosed in Bailey is not the same as the claimed data packet that has cache coherency in the target memory. Thus, Applicant submits that Bailey fails to teach the invention as noted by the Examiner.

In order to clearly claim the embodiments of the invention and further distinguish the invention over the cited art, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to recite that the packets are data packets, which are transferred between the two nodes by a bi-directional bus, and that the second bridge identifies the first memory as located in the first node and converts the data packet to an uncacheable data access request to the first node instead of performing a cache coherent memory access operation to access the first memory from the second node, so that the access to the first memory does not access a coherent fabric of the second memory in the second node.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims distinguish over the combination of Keller and Bailey and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant solicits for the allowance of pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 04/01/2010

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/

William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email:wkidd@texaspatents.com